ED 326 276 JC 910 010

TITLE Program Review: Staff and Organizational Development, 1989-90.
INSTITUTION College of Marin, Kentfield, Calif.
PUB DATE Oct 90
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Research; Community Colleges; Conferences; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Development; Inservice Education; *Management Development; Models; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Staff Development; Two Year Colleges; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

College of Marin (California) is in the process of developing program review models for all of its programs and services. This report presents the results of the first-time implementation of the program review model development for the college's Staff and Organizational Development Program. Covering 1989-90 activities, the report reviews the objectives, implementation, and evaluation of the college's faculty, classified (support) staff, management, and college-wide staff development programs. The following activities and outcomes are highlighted: (1) faculty development activities included a semester-long course and series of workshops on classroom research; three instructional skills workshops; 12 individually funded faculty research and development projects; 33 flex-day (paid leave) workshops covering such topics as teaching abroad and institutional racism; and the establishment of a teaching resource center; (2) classified staff development programs included eight in-house workshops covering such topics as self-esteem, health and fitness, and computer literacy; and 15 off-campus workshops covering such topics as first aid, woodworking, and ethics; (3) management development programs included monthly management workshops, and a workshop on effective cabinet meetings held for cabinet members; and (4) college-wide staff development programs included a newsletter, a holiday dinner dance, and employee appreciation day. The report concludes with an end-of-year evaluation of the overall program and an evaluation of the campus climate. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326276

PROGRAM REVIEW: STAFF AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1989-90

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Barry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Office of Staff and Organizational Development

October 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Purpose of Program 2

Goal of Program 2

Faculty Development 3

Classroom Research 3

Instructional Skills Workshops 5

Individual Research and Development 6

Flex Activities 7

Teaching Resource Center 8

Classified (Support) Staff Development 9

In-House Workshops 9

Conferences, Workshops, Classes 10

Management Development 11

In-House Workshops 11

Cabinet Training 12

College-Wide Staff Development 13

Newsletter 13

Holiday Dinner Dance 14

Employee Appreciation Day 14

Teaching Resource Center 15

End-Of-Year Evaluation of Overall Program 15

Evaluation of Campus Climate 17

PROGRAM REVIEW: STAFF AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
1989-90

College of Marin is in the process of developing program review models for all of its programs and services. In the Planning and Development unit, several program review models have been developed. One of these models is for an annual review of the Staff and Organizational Development program.

What follows is a report of the 1989-90 Staff and Organizational Development program that represents the first implementation of the program review model. The model will be refined during the 1990-91 year and implemented annually. The results of the program review will be used in setting objectives for the Staff and Organizational Development program in the annual planning process.

10/1/90

PURPOSE OF PROGRAM

The mission of the Staff Development program at the College of Marin is to provide educational and training opportunities for development of college employees toward the ultimate goal of improved programs and services that help students succeed and to create a cohesive and supportive environment within the institution.

The program is staffed by a full time Director, a full time Technician and a part time clerical helper. The program is administered through the Office of Planning and Development and is guided by a College Employee Development Committee (CEDC) comprised of faculty, support staff and administrators, and a management and faculty union committee.

Funding is derived from a number of sources: state categorical funds designated for staff development, private grant funds designated for improvement of student learning and state general funds.

Some faculty and staff development activities such as sabbatical and conference leave are administered by other offices; they do not fall under the purview of the Staff and Organizational Development office.

BACKGROUND

In July of 1989, the College Employee Development Committee (CEDC) met for an all day retreat to develop a mission statement for the program, to propose goals and activities for the year and to develop a sense of team membership. As a result of that meeting, the mission statement was agreed upon.

All employees of the college were asked to complete a needs assessment survey to assist the committee in its planning process. ,Implementation of the activities that were suggested and prioritized by the committee are described below.

GOAL OF PROGRAM

To improve the knowledge, skills, attitudes and performance of the faculty, support staff, and administrators of College of Marin.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Objective: To develop a program that will engage faculty in self-appraisal and self-directed changes in their teaching performance and in the impact their teaching has on student learning.

Implementation: Classroom Research (CR)

In Fall of 1989, 29 faculty members enrolled in a semester-long project called Classroom Research based on the model designed by Dr. K. Patricia Cross and Dr. Thomas A. Angelo at UC Berkeley. Course outlines were developed and distributed describing the responsibilities of each participant and the deadline dates for the submission of required reports. Two training workshops were presented during pre-school in-service training days (flex), one for beginners and one for those researchers who participated in the program during 1988-89. Four more workshops were scheduled throughout the semester during which faculty met and discussed with their peers what was happening in their research projects. Each of them also met with the Director on a one-on-one basis to discuss his/her project and revise it if necessary. Five report formats were distributed (along with a handbook, Classroom Assessment Techniques, Cross, Angelo) and were submitted, including a final report at the end of the semester. This program was repeated in the Spring with 36 faculty participants.

Evaluation

Retention rates and GPA's of students in regular classes and those in classes where faculty used Classroom Research were analyzed to determine what quantitatively measurable impact, if any, projects had on student learning. None were found. Qualitative measures also were requested from faculty in their final report. Some typical responses were:

1. In what ways has your project affected your teaching in the focus class?

   "This whole process has made me evaluate more critically what I think I am doing in the classroom. It certainly makes it very evident that I need to more closely evaluate my various teaching strategies on an ongoing basis."

   "I'm surprised to find that I feel more energetic and interested in teaching when I know what my students are thinking about."

2. In what ways has it affected your students' learning in that class?

"The students did better on their tests and used more sophisticated sentence structure in their writing at the end of the course than at the beginning." (English Class)

"The students felt more a part of the class, because they saw their input was leading to specific changes as the course progressed."

3. What evidence do you have to support the above?

"To demonstrate that students' writing skills have improved, I have paragraphs from the last three semesters showing steady improvement. By the end of this semester, all but two students were actively using the techniques."

"73% of the comments identified cognitive actions that the students could do to improve their analytical skill development. This data supports the notion that mature learners recognize that they have an important role to play in the learning process and must actively participate in that process."

4. What has been the most enjoyable aspect of this project?

"The closeness to teachers, staff development people, and students. Nothing beats teamwork and sharing!"

"It has been rewarding to see just how grateful the students are to have a say in their education."

There were no statistically significant differences found in the success rates and retention rates of students involved in the Classroom Research project for 1989-90. However, when Classroom Researchers were asked to what degree they had incorporated the use of Classroom Assessment Techniques into their normal teaching methods, they responded, on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest, with a mean of 7.3. A previous evaluation concluded that, after three semesters of being a formal participant in the Classroom Research project, faculty had incorporated the use of the Techniques into their normal teaching methods. The most frequently mentioned change in teaching and learning behavior was that students were more actively involved in learning - one of the major principles of learning theory supported by fifty years of educational research.

Implementation: Instructional Skills Workshops (ISW)

In the Spring of 1990, a series of three separate workshops were scheduled in Instructional Skills. Two faculty members who had been previously trained as facilitators served as the trainer/facilitators in this project. Three weekends in February, March and April were set aside to train a total of fifteen self-selected faculty members, five at each session. Each workshop began on Friday at 4:00 PM and lasted through Sunday at 5:00 PM. All trainees and trainers were housed in a hotel and spent approximately 21 hours in their training program. All trainees administered a pre-test in a focus class asking their students for feedback on their teaching techniques. As a follow-up to these training workshops, a post-test was also administered and all trainees invited a peer into their focus class to observe their teaching and to give them feedback on their skill acquisition. A final two-hour workshop was scheduled in May in which all fifteen participants and the two trainers met to discuss and evaluate the impact this training had on their students' learning.

1. In what ways has this workshop affected your teaching in the focus class?

> "I began to be more careful in assessing how much (and what) students knew from reading the text assignment before the class. I then geared my presentations in class accordingly. I was more careful to summarize. I also made it a point to check at the end of a presentation to find out how much students had absorbed."
>
> "I eliminated a pre-conceived idea that I would not come across well on a video tape (the fear that I did not want to see myself as a teacher)....helped me to see where I can improve my presentations."

2. In what ways has it affected your students' learning in that class?

> "They seemed to become more skillful at analyzing problems and applying techniques learned to new situations. The class seemed to narrow the spread between the best and worst student."
>
> "Revised questioning techniques have challenged students to put their thinking caps on. The students reported increased insight into their own thinking processes and how to put information together."

3. What evidence do you have to support the above?

> "...the new teaching techniques were tested in a demonstration lecture to the focus class....The same material was also discussed in other...classes but without most of the new teaching techniques. In a final examination question

based directly on this topic, the focus class students performed substantially better (about 15-20%) than other students."

"This may, of course, be a coincidence, but the students' scores on the one test I gave since the workshop were higher than on the previous five (tests)."

4. What has been the most enjoyable aspect of the project?

"The opportunity of being sequestered for an entire weekend with wonderful colleagues - all from diversified fields of expertise - was invaluable; without doubt this experience and sharing of teaching techniques, constructive suggestions for improvement, different teaching styles has been the most rewarding and effective experience I've had with colleagues in 27 years of teaching experience."

"In summary, as a teacher, one is 'alone' in the classroom and in preparation of lessons; ISW gave me some trusted friends and a sense of belonging to a supportive, nurturing group."

"Non-threatening, non-intimidating, open camaraderie environment."

Evaluation

The results of pre and post-tests administered to the students of faculty who participated in Instructional Skills Workshops reported that, after the workshops, faculty improved on two thirds of the twenty-three desired behaviors. The general areas of behavior were: Clarification of purpose and objective; Pre-test; Choice and delivery of instructional techniques; Use of instructional aids; Questioning techniques and encouraging participation; Post-test for learning; and Closure.

Implementation: Individual Research & Development (IR&D)

In the Fall of 1989, four Individual Research and Development (IR&D) projects were submitted to CEDC and recommended for funding. These projects covered such topics as:

Developing Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) in Algebra
Developing software demonstration for dBase III
Developing software demonstration for Lotus 1-2-3
Developing software demonstration for Ventura

Evaluation

All projects were completed by the end of the academic year. All final reports have not yet been submitted.

In the Spring of 1990, eight Individual Research and Development projects were submitted to CEDC and recommended for funding. These projects covered the following topics:

Introduction to Sociology; Laser Video Disc
Court Reporting Video Tapes (12)
Third World Drugs; research
Introduction to Business; "Decide" data input program
(Joint project between two faculty)
Speed Reading Media course video tapes (10)
Algebra CAI (Instructor's Guidelines, Student Workbook)
Statistics Media Course; Evaluation: Lecture vs. Media

Evaluation

Most of the projects are currently in progress. One, however, Introduction to Business, "Decide" Data input program has been completed and a final report has been submitted. In the report, the instructor was asked, What did you learn about your teaching or students' learning as a result of this project? His response was:

"It taught me to better understand the complexities of the process and to try to put myself in the place of a typical student while making changes or improvements. I eventually got a student opinion on every change or revision. I did not realize the amount of work this project would require."

Implementation: Flex Activities (Flex)

According to Title V of the California Education Code, community colleges must provide a minimum of 160 instructional days a year and community college instructors must serve a minimum of 175 days a year. With the permission of the Chancellor's office, districts may opt to provide a flexible schedule of in-service training to instructors anywhere from one to fifteen days during the academic year. College of Marin has opted to include 15 days of in-service training into its academic year. Under the terms of the District/Union contract, eight of those days are to be held in the Fall and seven days in the Spring. Four of the Fall days and three of the Spring days must include mandatory on-site activities designed by a

management/union committee and implemented by the Staff and Organizational Development Office.

In Fall of 1989, 33 workshops were presented to faculty during the scheduled mandatory on-site days. Most of these workshops were presented by College of Marin faculty and management and topics ranged from "UC Berkeley English Requirements" to "Teaching in China," from "Developmental Theory and How it Applies in the Classroom" to "Orientation for Part Time Instructors." In Spring of 1990, 41 workshops were offered in the scheduled mandatory on-site days. These were also presented by local faculty, but were interspersed with outside speakers such as Reverend Cecil Williams on the topic of "Institutional Racism and Faculty Responsibility," Annie Lamott (recipient of a Guggenheim Fellowship) on "Discussion with a Writer," and Ron Takaki, professor of Ethnic Studies, UC Berkeley on "Putting Cultural Diversity into the Curriculum."

Evaluation

Evaluation cards were distributed at every workshop asking the participants to rank the workshop on a scale of 1-5 (1 being poor, 5 being outstanding) as to its effectiveness, if it should be offered again and inviting comments. The mean response for all Fall and Spring workshops was 4.2 (above average) as to their effectiveness and if they should be offered again. Specific comments included:

(Annie Lamott): Terrific, Inspirational, Outstanding
(Ron Takaki): Informative, UCB outlook, Awareness
(Cecil Williams): Offered hope, His experiences, Greater understanding, Enlightening

Implementation: Teaching Resource Center (TRC)

In August of 1989, a Teaching Resource Center was established in the Learning Resource Center at the Kentfield Campus. A full-time Staff Development Technician was housed there to be available to faculty and staff for their development needs, particularly in the area of computer literacy. Four MacIntoshes, two IBM PCs and other state of the art equipment was installed and training workshops were scheduled. Workshops were advertised in Communique, the college newsletter, and faculty and staff were invited to drop in at any time to take advantage of the facilities. Nine computer-related training workshops were held for faculty during the academic year and the Teaching Resource Center was open on a drop-in basis from 8:00-4:30 PM, Monday through Friday.

Evaluation

All faculty users of the Teaching Resource Center were sent a questionnaire regarding use of the TRC. They were asked to rank the ceiling height, lighting, efficiency and overall comfort of the new facility on a scale of 1 to 3, 1 being poor and 3 being good. The overall mean for all categories was 2.2. They were also asked for suggestions and/or comments. The following is a sample of the responses:

"Karin (Mack, Staff Development Technician) is doing a wonderful job."

"I think Karin is doing a great job, however, need more staffing for evenings."

"More programs on direct teaching with computers."

CLASSIFIED (SUPPORT) STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Objective: To involve as many support staff as possible in job-related development activities that will enhance their performance on the job and ultimately improve services to students.

Implementation: In-House Workshops

Based on a needs assessment survey administered by the Classified Senate, the CEDC recommended on-going, in-house workshops be established to meet some identified classified staff needs. In December of 1989, the first of a series of workshops was presented in the TRC on the Kentfield Campus and in the administrative conference room on the Indian Valley Campus. The College released support staff for in-house workshops if job related and the supervisor approved. Evaluation cards were distributed at each session and an evaluation form for the entire program was distributed in June 1990.

The following topics were addressed in the eight workshops presented: Assertiveness Training, Self-Esteem, Health and Fitness, Phone Power, Computer Software, Time Management and DOS for Beginners. Workshops were held the first and second Friday of each month, one at each campus. Notices were distributed and personnel were asked to get written permission from their supervisors to attend. Presenters were culled from faculty, management and external consultants. 217 classified personnel attended these workshops.

Evaluation

Participants were asked to rank the content of the 1989-90 training program on a scale of 1-10 (1 being poorest, 10 being best). The mean ranking for all workshops was 7.2. On a similar ranking of presentation skills, the mean was 7.7. Participants were also asked to name one specific behavioral change they had made as a result of the training offered. The following are some of the responses:

"Became less intimidated by the PC." (Computer Software)

"How to better coordinate my disk files." (DOS)

"Being polite on the phone. The class helped me to realize there is a 'person' on the other end..."(Phone power)

"I am trying to remember to stop myself from typing, etc. as I hold the phone with my shoulder causing great neck problems." (Health and Fitness)

"I have tried to be more organized and have a more positive attitude." (Time Management & Self-Esteem)

Implementation: Conferences, Workshops, Classes

In February of 1990, on recommendation of CEDC, the College agreed to the following guidelines for implementing additional Classified Staff Development activities:

1. The College may pay the cost of fees and books, (but not release time) for attendance at a College of Marin Community Service course if job related and the supervisor approves.

2. The College may pay the cost of tuition, books AND release time for attendance and satisfactory completion (Credit, C or above grade) of a College of Marin credit course if the course is job related and the supervisor approves.

3. If an employee has need of a specific type of technical training that cannot be offered on campus, the College may sponsor attendance at that training program.

CEDC then recommended a form to be used by all support personnel to request approval for such activities, including in-house workshops. The Staff Development office monitors these activities and reports the number, nature and disposition of

office monitors these activities and reports the number, nature and disposition of staff requests to CEDC on a regular basis.

During 1989-90, support staff attended 15 off-campus workshops/training sessions. Topics included: First Aid, Smog Test Preparation, Woodworking, Ethics of Confidentiality and Chemical Hygiene Plan For Laboratories.

Evaluation

An evaluation component has not yet been developed. The Staff Development Office plans to recommend some type of evaluation form to CEDC when it reconvenes in Fall 1990.

MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

Objective: To involve the management group in monthly workshops that are designed to improve organizational functioning.

Note: Conferences and workshops for managers are administered by the Office of Fiscal Services.

Implementation: In-House Workshops

Based on needs assessments, the Director of Staff Development and the College President design a monthly series of management workshops. In September of 1989, the topic was Setting Objectives. The next six workshops focused on a review of the Institutional Inventory of the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education developed under the auspices of the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). This inventory asks eleven pertinent questions on each of the following topics: Climate, Academic Practices, Curriculum, Faculty, Academic and Student Support Services and Facilities. Participants were asked to rank their answers by "Very Often" to "Don't Know." Answers were tallied by a show of hands and discussions ensued on questions that had a wide range of answers. Discussions were so lengthy that review of the Inventory has not yet been completed. Summaries were kept of all suggestions for change and implementation and will be the subject of a planning session in the 1990-91 academic year. The last workshop of the year was off campus, at a

workshop presented by Career Track, a commercial training company, on the topic of "Leadership."

Evaluation

Participants were asked to rate the content of the 1989-90 management training program on a scale of 1-10 (1 being lowest, 10 being highest). The mean score was 8.2. They were also asked to name the topic/session most interesting to them and why. The following are some of their responses:

> "Climate - made me think about the Colleges' P.R. priorities."
>
> "Most informative about areas I don't usually interact with."
>
> "I learned much more about the institution, and several issues were raised and directions discussed that could prove very useful."
>
> "Got at some central issues facing the college."

Participants were also asked to name one specific change they had made as a result of the training offered. Responses:

> "I planned a 'College Effectiveness' workshop for Fall."
>
> "I have a greater appreciation for the job that others have to do and I'm more tolerant of their positions."
>
> "I asked to change some of my objectives because they were goals not objectives. I ask staff for input on office procedures more now than before."
>
> "I review objectives with my staff now on a quarterly basis."

Implementation: Cabinet Training

In September of 1989, a workshop was held for Cabinet members only: President, Vice Presidents, Director of Personnel and Executive Assistant to the President. The purpose of the workshop was to help participants understand their role and function in Cabinet meetings. As a result of the workshop, the Director of Staff and Organizational Development served as an observer and reporter to the Cabinet on its meeting processes for about eight subsequent weeks and several new processes were initiated in the weekly meetings.

Evaluation

An informal evaluation was made of the workshop in which the following responses were noted:

"I liked that people could be honest."

"I felt safe with a facilitator."

"Role playing made me experience frustration with that job."

"Watching someone else play your role and seeing things you don't want to see is hard."

"I found role playing hard - too close."

"I learned a lot."

No further evaluation has been requested or made, although the Director of Staff and Organizational Development sends out a questionnaire from time to time asking what is working and what is not working.

COLLEGE-WIDE STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Objective: To encourage collegiality and a pleasant environment in which to work.

Implementation: Newsletter

In June of 1989, the Staff Development Office assumed responsibility for a college-wide newsletter entitled *COMmunique'*. During 1989-90, ten monthly issues were published. A column was reserved for the President, an on-going Kudos section was established as were columns entitled "Welcome Aboard," "Point of View," and "For Your Information." Articles highlighting staff accomplishments were written with accompanying pictures and events were heralded and reported.

Evaluation

No evaluation instrument has been developed as yet. The Staff Development office plans to develop one in 1990-91.

Implementation: Holiday Dinner Dance

In September of 1989, a volunteer group of classified, faculty, and the Director of Staff and Organizational Development began meeting to plan an event that would include the entire college community. It was decided to hold a formal dinner party during the holiday season to celebrate unity. Arrangements were made, invitations sent and approximately one hundred persons attended. Along with dancing music, special entertainment was provided by the College of Marin's Chamber Singers.

Evaluation

Participants expressed their appreciation in letters to *COMmunique'*, such as this one:

"My hat is off to you for planning a truly classy affair. Saturday night (12/9) at the Meadow Club was a winner in every respect. Many thanks to you all and where do I sign up for next year?"

Implementation: Employee Appreciation Day

In May of 1988, the Staff Development Office inaugurated a Teacher Appreciation Day for which students receiving degrees were asked to identify the instructor who had made the most significant difference in their lives and why. The instructor with the most nominations was named Teacher of the Year and was honored with a plaque awarded at an end-of-the-year picnic. A booklet was also published citing all the persons named and quoting what the students had said about them. For 1989-90, this ceremony was expanded to include all employees. Support staff were asked to name an outstanding employee among their peers to be honored as well. On Commencement day, the third annual picnic was held on the Kentfield Campus. Over three hundred people attended. The College's jazz band performed. Awards were presented to the outstanding Teacher of the Year and the outstanding Support Staff Person of the Year.

Evaluation

No formal evaluation was held, but the staff received numerous positive comments on the affair.

Implementation: Teaching Resource Center

Since the Teaching Resource Center was designed for use by all College employees, activities were scheduled that included all groups. Statistics were kept on the amount of use made by each group with the following results:

Meetings held: 35
Training activities held: 34
Faculty users: 346
Support staff users: 166
Management users: 23

Of the 34 Training activities held, at least nine were demonstrations and training in specialized computer software. Demonstrations were given in Pagemaker, Hypercard, Excel/Wingz, Adobe Illustrator, and MS Works. Training sessions were held in Beginning MacIntosh, Advanced MacIntosh, and Finale. Both demonstration and training were given in Multimedia Techniques.

Evaluation

Evaluation cards were distributed at every session and on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being low and 5 being high, all workshops averaged out to 4.67. The lowest mean for an individual workshop was 4.16; and the highest 5.0. Also, the following comments were made:

"Excellent training - was easy to understand the concepts."

"An opportunity to ask questions."

"Loved the simplicity of the instruction."

"Small size of the class let us cover the essentials in a short time."

END-OF-YEAR EVALUATION OF OVERALL PROGRAM

All FACULTY members who participated in certain staff development activities were asked the following question:

"What else, if anything, can this office do to help you do your job?"

Responses:

"Make the TRC fully functional for IBM PC users. Focus has been totally Mac."

"This 'treatment' of faculty instilled, I think, a sense of our importance and responsibility."

"Please continue what you're doing. It's good for our morale."

"The ISW weekend (perks) really made us feel special - (the dinners lasted 3+ hours, thanks)."

"Continue finding these great workshops you offer: ISW (Instructional Skills Workshops), CR (Classroom Research), LSI (Learning Skills Inventory)."

"Communication from the Staff Development Office is excellent on the whole."

As with faculty, SUPPORT STAFF were sent an evaluation form at the end of the year asking them to recommend other topics of interest, other presenters, strongest training needs and what else, if anything, the Staff Development office could do to help them do their job better. Some responses:

"Keep asking questions and responding, thanks."

"Allow release time for cross training in other areas."

"If a certain class fills up quickly (or has a waiting list) offer that course again with the instructors who collected the best reviews from attendees."

"Keep giving us options to attend these wonderful sessions."

When MANAGERS were asked:

" What else, if anything, can this office do to help you do your job?" The responses were:

"Cut down on my non-productive time."

"Continue to provide the opportunity for us to interact and begin to include Dept. chairs in some sessions to begin to spread the interaction."

"I hope we have a chance to review the ideas that came out of this year's sessions. There were some very good projects that would be wonderful to get started."

"Some opportunities for just chatting out ideas and problem solving as a group."

"A better process of management evaluation, including broader input (faculty,

"A better process of management evaluation, including broader input (faculty, support staff, other managers)."

EVALUATION OF CAMPUS CLIMATE

In May, 1990, An Institutional Inventory of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education was administered to the College community. A total of 1521 instruments were sent to employees, trustees and students with an overall response rate of 21%. This rate was large enough to be representative of the College community as a whole. In the first section of the inventory there were eleven questions dealing with the climate of the institution. The average response rate for the section on climate was 3.02 on a scale of 1-5 with 1 a negative response and 5 a positive response. Based on that response, it was felt that the College community had a "neutral" feeling about the climate of the institution, better than the somewhat negative feelings expressed about the climate in previous years. Individual comments and letters of appreciation received by the Staff Development Office indicate that many of the respondents credit the Staff Development program with this positive change in the climate.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
JAN 18 1991